

# THE CLARION.

By E. Barksdale, J. L. Power, Harris Barksdale.

Official Journal of the State of Mississippi.

Thursday, - - - January 27, 1881

FOR \$3.00.

To any present subscriber renewing, or to any new subscriber, we will send THE WEEKLY CLARION two years for \$3.00. To any old or new subscriber, sending us \$3.00, we will send THE WEEKLY CLARION for one year, and either of the following journals:

THE NEW YORK WEEKLY HERALD. THE NEW YORK WEEKLY SUN. THE LOUISVILLE COURIER-JOURNAL. THE MEMPHIS WEEKLY APPEAL. THE NEW ORLEANS WEEKLY DEMOCRAT. Subscriptions will not be received for either of the papers named except in connection with a remittance for THE WEEKLY CLARION. Address: POWER & BARKSDALE.

The crop of cotton for the year 1879-80 was 5,761,252 bales, against 5,074,000 for the year just previous.

Under both the Apportionment bills introduced in Congress, the representation of Mississippi would be increased one.

We are strengthened in our belief of the economy and wisdom of reducing the number of Senators and Representatives, by the hearty concurrence of Mr. Justice J. A. P. Campbell in the proposition.

REYNOLDS, C. B. GALLOWAY, and W. L. C. HUNNITT, of Mississippi Conference, have been associated with Dr. Parker in editing the N. O. Christian Advocate. They will interest to one of the best journals in the country.

Last week we published a letter from Judge Chandler in reference to the remedies by attachment under the United States and State's laws. An able answer to the positions assumed by Judge Chandler, is made by Hon. W. H. F. Fitzgerald, whose letter is printed in another column.

In this paper is copied from the Washington Post the declaration of most of the Mississippi delegation in favor of the appointment of Senator Bruce in the Garfield Cabinet. The agitation has spread from Washington to the country, and one of our correspondents in objecting to the appointment of Bruce takes up the cudgel for Hon. Peter Mitchell. The dispute seems to be waxing warm, and we have concluded that as for the CLARION, it will stand firm under.

Nothing that we may say touching a Legislative Apportionment can be construed as an expression one way or the other, pro or con, on the subject of an Extra Session. We determined at the beginning to take no part editorially in the discussion of that subject, and opened our columns to communications on both sides. A reapportionment must be made by the next Legislature, if not by the present, and the paramount question is, how is it to be done? It is to this point that we shall address ourselves most earnestly because it involves consequences of vast moment to the people of Mississippi.

We have published in this paper the decision of the Election Commissioners of Warren county in the contested election case in that county. While we would have preferred a different result of the election, we are bound to affirm our belief in the correctness of the decision. Suffrage is a great constitutional privilege, and the benefit of the doubt should always be given to the voter. It is a violation of the intent of the supreme law to deprive a citizen of his vote upon purely technical grounds. Or as the Board has best expressed it, "in the absence of any fraud, the ignorance, neglect, or willful acts of officers of election should not deprive the citizen of his constitutional right." The adoption of this rule would be a safe guide in the conduct of elections in our State.

## The Grant Pension Bill.

By reference to another column, it will be seen that on the 24th a test vote was taken on the bill to retire Gen. Grant with the rank and pay of General. The meaning of the bill is that he is to receive a compensation of \$17,000 per annum without performing any service to entitle him to it. It was opposed by the Democrats of the Senate almost solidly, as it should have been. Honor and compensation have been conferred upon Gen. Grant equivalent to all the service he has ever rendered. The rank of General of the Army was created for his special benefit. He gave it up to take the Presidency and served two terms at a salary of \$50,000 per annum most of the time, to say nothing of the tens of thousands he had previously drawn from the Treasury. Gifts of money and property have been liberally showered upon him by the millionaires. He is rich, strong, robust, in the prime of manhood, is constantly tendered remunerative places, and the sum proposed to be taken out of the people to crown him with more riches, is without warrant of the Constitution, anti-republican, and a fraud on the public treasury. The talk about his being put on the "retired" list, except in so much as voting him \$17,000 per annum without consideration, is stupid humbuggery. He is already in training for the Presidency in 1884. We enter our protest against the scheme. The question is up, and as the House will soon be Republican, and the Senate is nearly so, we would not be surprised if the measure passed, but Democrats are right in washing their hands of it.

THE Enterprise Courier says that Hon. J. W. Fowell is counsel for the citizens of Clarke who have been charged with violating the federal election laws. The Courier thinks they will come out right side up.

## Senator George.

J. Z. George, the new Democratic Senator from Mississippi, is a leading lawyer of his section. The people of his State predict a brilliant future for him.

## The Apportionment Question.

THE CLARION directs attention to the State apportionment as the most important question involved in the ensuing State election. It is a question of the greatest importance, and one that cannot be left to any party or any branch of the legislature, every citizen should have one representative for territory, and after that a fair apportionment should be made on population to bring the House to a membership of 100. Can a fair basis be taken than the one we suggest? If so, we should like to see it presented, and we shall take pleasure in adopting it.—Hinds County Gazette.

We ourselves do not think that there ought to be any great diversity of opinion with reference to the Legislative Apportionment, but we apprehend our contemporary will find that there will be when the work comes to be done. We concur in the opinion that it should be done fairly and with equal regard for the just rights of all the counties and sections of the State. This is not the case with the present system, which is the result of a studied and deliberate determination to gain party advantage at the sacrifice of the rights and interests of particular counties and sections, all must admit.

Our readers have seen that there is an entire concurrence of opinion between the CLARION and the Gazette upon the point of securing at least one Representative to every county and of reducing the membership of the House from 120 (not 116 as erroneously printed in our last issue) to 100. As to the Senate, the Constitution says that the number of Senators shall not be less than one-fourth nor more than one-third of the whole number of Representatives. If this basis be taken, the Senate might be reduced to twenty-five members, thus making the reduction of 32 members for the two houses. The saving to the taxpayers would be not less than \$25,000 per session of the Legislature, a consideration which is not to be disregarded in framing the new Apportionment.

## A Blind Guide.

The Vicksburg Herald comes out in a double-edged attack and tells the Southern States in Congress not to accept the \$1,800,000 in which it is proposed to appropriate this season for the improvement of the Mississippi river, and to await the coming of the Garfield administration which, it says, will do more for the South than the "hide-bound Northern Democracy." We apprehend that our friend of the Herald is a bad adviser in this matter. The country has had twenty years of Republican rule without any accompanying boon to the South, but a great deal of illiberality, vindictive and oppressive legislation. We do not know upon what ground the Herald bases its loving confidence in Northern Republicanism, unless it be a paragraph in Garfield's letter of acceptance which we surmise was a bait thrown out to catch gudgeons. His words were very sweet, but soft words butter no parsnips. For a long time he was a leading member of the House of Congress which originates appropriations, and never identified his name prominently with any measure for the improvement of the Mississippi river.

Just in time to show that the Herald may be advising the friends of the Mississippi river improvement to lean on a staff that may break and pierce them, comes the New York Times, the most influential of Republican organs, with the following significant article: "The Mississippi river may properly be regarded as a great national highway, for the improvement of whose navigation the nation may with perfect justice be taxed. But when any such gigantic scheme is proposed as that of the \$2,000,000 to be asked for in one year, people may be excused for demanding that some better evidence than has yet appeared should be furnished in favor of the utility of such a project. The long-rolling tactics by which the huge appropriation is to be pushed are enough to excite suspicion, and the undue influence of Southern members to make the Mississippi improvement project the basis of a system of patronage and calculated to alarm those who would have to pay for this species of national development. Should the Mississippi State prove successful, the always bloated proportions of the river and harbor bill will be very apparent, and the aggregate amount of the bill will be considerably exceeded."

The St. Louis Republican, in reply to the foregoing, reminds the Times that a few days ago a bill was introduced in Congress appropriating \$750,000 for the improvement of the Delaware river, and there was no opposition to it on the part of the Times. It adds that the Mississippi—though "a great national highway"—is unfortunate enough to be a Western river and that if its location could be changed so that it would play as important a part in the commerce of the North and East as it now does in the commerce of the West and South, would the Times grudge this \$2,300,000? Not if it were given every year for twenty years.

Our advice to the members interested in the Mississippi river improvement is to persist in claiming for the incoming Administration such aid for that great object as its national character demands, and to take the \$1,800,000 now, and as much more as they can get.

## The Grant Pension Bill.

Senator Logan's Bill: SECTION 1. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That recognition of the eminent public services of Ulysses S. Grant, late General of the Army and ex-President of the United States, the President be and hereby is authorized to appoint him, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to the retired list, with the rank and full pay of General of the Army; and SEC. 2. Be it further enacted, That and time when the President shall consider that an emergency exists requiring the services of General U. S. Grant on active duty, he is hereby authorized to assign him to any command commensurate with the rank of General.

(This scheme to pension Grant for his services in 1878. He is understood to be worth several hundred thousand dollars; and has drawn nearly half million from the public treasury, and where is the justice of voting him a life salary of \$17,000 a year?)

## The Kellogg Case.

We see the Democrats are digging into the Kellogg case, and we cannot understand it, unless they are still possessed by the spirit of blind prejudice. The Washington correspondent of the New Orleans Times says that leading Republican Senators wonder how Senator George, of this State, will get into the Senate or how long he will stay if Ben. Hill and other Democratic Senators demonstrate that the Senate may overrule the records of State elections. The CLARION logically answers these conjectures.—Vicksburg Herald.

The foregoing which appeared in the Vicksburg Herald, is taken up and hung back at by the Washington Republican. As a reason it hasn't the weight of a feather. To begin with, if Kellogg in defiance of the prayer of Louisiana, was not permitted to remain in the seat to which no legal body in the Senate would be assent, and Gen. George's admission could be seen by his own lips. Besides, then, Gen. George was elected, there was not a man, woman or child that disputed the validity of the Legislature; nor is there a contestant to his seat; nor is there a State asking his exclusion; but just the reverse. We might answer the Herald and its endorser, the Republican, in the language of Senator Hill: Gentlemen are trying to alarm somebody by saying, "Oh, what a precedent you would establish, a dangerous precedent, and if you can reverse the decision of Senate nobody is safe in his seat." It is possible that any man in the Senate of the United States can be entrapped by that sort of an argument? To vacate the seat of a man not elected by his Legislature, would that be a precedent to vacate the seat (or refuse admission to a seat) of a man who was elected by the Legislature? To vacate the seat of a man whom no legal body in the State and declared not a Legislature, is that to be a precedent to vacate the seat of a man whose Legislature is recognized by the State?

The following is the language of the gallant Senator Vance, of North Carolina, who spoke as became an American Senator: Mr. President, I am willing to see every Senator's seat in this House disturbed and called in question and put in jeopardy whenever it is shown to me that he is here as the choice of an illegal mob in the streets of some city, instead of the choice or representative of the Legislature of a sovereign State. I am perfectly willing to have my own or other Senator's seat so far as I am concerned, disturbed, whenever that state of fact appears. I will tell you what is a dangerous precedent. It is a dangerous precedent to let a man come here and sit on the floor by the predicate of an ephemeral body of men which assembled and adjourned, and called themselves the Legislature of a State, that dissolved and acknowledged they never were the Legislature of the State. That is a dangerous precedent.

## The Funding Bill.

The following are the essential provisions of this measure as it passed the House: First, the interest shall be 3 per cent.; second, the bonds proper shall not exceed \$400,000,000, and shall be redeemable after five years and payable after ten; third, certificates bearing the same interest and to the extent of \$300,000,000 may be issued, redeemable in one year and payable in five, the same being in denominations of \$10, \$20 and \$50, and either registered or coupon; fourth, the national banks must use these 3 per cents in securing their circulation, and their deposits of public money at least; no bond on which interest has ceased shall be used for such purposes of surety; fifth, the present privilege of contracting their own circulation shall be taken from the banks. Section 4 is in these words:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, in his opinion it shall be necessary, to use not exceeding \$50,000,000 of the standard gold and silver coin in the Treasury in the redemption of the 5 and 6 per cent. bonds of the United States, and he may, at any time, apply the surplus money in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, or so much thereof as he may consider proper, to the purchase or redemption of United States bonds or certificates so purchased or redeemed, and he may use the same in sinking fund, but shall be canceled.

The bill, Mississippi members voted for the bill. A SPEAKING OF the approaching campaign in Mississippi, says that "there is an agreement on the part of the leading themselves outside of political organizations, to try and induce ex-Governor and ex-Senator J. L. Alcorn to run for Governor as an independent or people's candidate." Ex-Governor Alcorn is a man of decided character, and ability at the hustings, with a strong following and his candidacy as the representative of all the various elements of opposition, if such a thing were possible, could not be safely ignored by the democracy in calculating the chances of victory.

THE Vicksburg Commercial referring to the vote to retain Kellogg in the Senate in defiance of the petition and protest of Louisiana, rejoices that "the nastiness is buried out of sight." The Commercial has very little to rejoice over. It strikes us that Kellogg is the nuisance and the vote keeps him in sight. We are afraid that he will be seen as well as smell before the next two years have passed.

NEW ENGLAND to the South: "Gentlemen, how can you expect to be considered ardent but barbarians so long as you carry revolvers? We are constantly shocked at this custom. However, remember that we are manufacturing pistols of all sorts and keep all the latest improvements in firearms. Don't go to Europe when you can just as well send your orders to us."

A CORRESPONDENT of the Picayune telegraphs from Washington that as it now seems certain that Kellogg will be allowed to keep his seat, the Republicans will be able, with Mahone's vote, to change the officers of the Senate and the leading committees, and that they expect to do this.

A BILL has been introduced in the Delaware legislature exempting from taxation for ten years at least, all persons coming into the State with the intention of colonizing. Such a law would be of great value to Mississippi. We must get out of the old grooves and move along.

The Mississippi Valley and Ship Island Railroad will be completed to Port Black in thirty days, and then on to Port Gibson.

## NOTES, NEWS AND NOTIONS.

Vanderbilt draws \$510,000 from the Government every ninety days; and the gold bugs are afraid he will starve to death should he be paid in silver.

General Hancock is seen in the city very frequently now.—N. Y. Express.

But we do not hear of so many distinguished Southerners calling upon him, as we did a few months since. Maybe it's because this is not the season to go North.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat says that the newly appointed Adjutant General of Missouri, Mr. Tutt, is too young for the place. Tut-tut! anybody can give the order, "lie down, melish! they are going to pop a cap!"

Judging from the way the Radical papers are puffing Confederate General Mahone, he must be "a bigger man than old Grant."

Senators Jones, of Florida, and Bayard, of Delaware, who were recently re-elected, set an example, which, though good, is not likely to be followed to any great extent. When the Legislatures of their States met, they remained in Washington and attended to their official business instead of returning home to coerce the members and to look after another term.

A dazzling headline in an exchange is: "Conkling at Cononchet—Gov. 'Sprague's version of the shot-gun episode told after it happened,' as if he would have given a version of the episode before it happened."

Gov. St. John, of Kansas, says that by the 1st of February there will not be a distillery, saloon or place where liquor can be had in that State. If the news gets out among the Mississippi darkeys the spring exodus will come to a dead halt. They will stand the bull-dozers rather than go where 'Publiken candidates do not set up free whiskey.

Gath says "Wilmington, Delaware, will be the next large city to grow up 'in the East'." If it grows much it will spread over the whole State.

Grass gave the colored men from the South some good advice, but he did not say any office one. The Governor of Minnesota intimated in his message that his State had repudiated, and he was immediately sent to serve his term in the lunatic asylum for not knowing that none but the Southern States ever repudiate.

There is a bill pending, introduced by Senator Hoar, to pension ex-Presidents at \$25,000 per annum.

An obituary writer in the New Orleans papers had a good notice of his departed friend and then spoiled the effect by closing with, "Good-bye old boy, good-bye," as if the old boy was going home.

The Washington Republican threatens that if this talk of a darkey in the cabinet is not discontinued at once, one will be appointed to "fret" the South. Another case of cutting off the nose to spite the face.

The Natchez Democrat says very few of the Adams county prisoners work out their fines. Most of them manage to raise the money. This shows the great improvement in the present over the old law. Now, offenders must contribute to the school fund or work; then they had only to take the pauper's oath when they got tired of staying in jail.

Within the past three months not less than 2,500 German immigrants have sailed from Europe for Texas direct, landing at Galveston. This makes up inquiry why Mississippi cannot quit her penny wise and pound foolish policy and adopt measures to induce immigration?

It does not follow because the "divine Sara" is slim, her audiences are.

A bill is pending in the New York Legislature providing that twenty lashes shall be laid on the backs of wife beaters.

E. A. Southern, the famous "Lord Dunsenry," is dead.

The House of Representatives have decided that Bisbee, Radical, and not Hull, Democrat, was elected from the 2d district of Florida, and the former has been seated. Such delay this is an outrage. The contest was begun two years ago. Hull has been permitted to occupy the seat and draw the pay until the term has about expired and now another is seated and will draw pay for the whole term, \$10,000. The case could have been and should have been decided within sixty days after Congress met two years ago.

Grant says that the only thing for Americans to do if DeLespess begins to build the Panama Canal is to stop it.

There is a great deal of cotton along the line of the Great Jackson route which the farmers are still holding out to the impassable condition of the roads leading to the public stores, and some that is still unpecked.—N. O. Times.

Don't you deceive yourself. There is very little cotton upon the route you speak of, either picked or unpicked.

The Funding Bill which has passed the House is a Democratic measure, not altogether such as we would have preferred, but its chief merits and essential features are that it provides for the speedy payment and not the perpetuation of the public debt as a permanent untaxed income for the benefit of capital, and for a reduction of taxes by reducing the interest to 3 per cent. Another commendable feature of the bill is the issue of \$300,000 in silver certificates. The Democrats carried this feature without a division. It virtually expands the currency to the amount named, the certificates being for sums as small as \$10 and made of constantly increasing value by bearing three per cent. interest.

The Water Valley Courier says that Col. E. M. Watson, the law partner of Col. Manning, is accompanying Capt. Buchanan on his rounds, and holds his witnesses down to law and the facts. The Courier learns from Mr. Watson that nothing has been developed that can possibly affect the election of Col. Manning. Just as we expected.

## The Kellogg Case.

It is pretty clearly settled by recent proceedings in the Senate that Senator Kellogg will not be ousted, but left to occupy the seat to which he was elected, and to misrepresent the State and people of Louisiana for two years longer. It is hardly conceivable that the Republicans would have treated a similar case in the same spirit. Had Kellogg been a Democrat, misrepresenting the State of Maine, they would have ejected him, as we did a few months since. Maybe it's because this is not the season to go North.

Well said. And the question further arises, what have the Democrats ever gained by conceding unquestioned rights to the Republicans, who are arrogant and aggressive—get all they can, and hold all they get?

## The Grant Pension Bill.

A correspondent of the Picayune telegraphs: Owing to the absence of Senators Maxey and Hampton, members of the Senate Military Committee, the Republican majority had a majority and carried the bill to retire Gen. Grant as Captain General. It was reported that the bill was introduced by Gen. Grant's Captain General. The bill was a leading cause of attachment for "many years, and had become well understood, though for a time troublesome to the courts to construe, etc."

It has never been construed by the court of last resort in the State.

In the case of Barney v. Scherling, 40 Miss. 320, an effort was made by counsel to have the late High Court pass upon it, but the case was settled upon other grounds and no allusion made to that by the court. It will be instructive to refer to the briefs of counsel in that case on that point.

Editors CLARION—I read a good deal lately about a place in Garfield's cabinet for Bruce (a), a sitting member of the United States Senate, erroneously accredited to this State. Some of the papers say that his appointment would give satisfaction to all the darkeys in the land, from freezing Canada to blooming Florida—that it would immediately stop the exodus—that the persecuted blacks who have already gone would return to the sugar plantations of Louisiana, and the cotton fields of Mississippi.

The late Gov. L. P. Butler, Esq., attorney on the other side, said in his brief: "The 'statute gives an attachment against the estate of a debtor when he is about to assign or dispose of his property with intent to defraud his creditors, or give an 'unfair preference to some of them. Our 'law permits preferences in such cases, and this statute, tacitly permitting the general practice, gives no reason for preferring an 'unfair preference. The preference must be 'unfair; but the law has nowhere defined what an unfair preference is. An 'insolvent may prefer one creditor to the exclusion of another, and this has never been held to be unfair. The law does not 'require him to pay pro rata, but leaves the 'whole matter to his honest judgment,' etc."

This question of unfair preference and a creditor is not alluded to in any of the reported opinions of the Supreme Court, except in the case of Roach v. Brandon, 57 Miss. Opinion p. 501, where the Court, say, "an application of firm assets to his individual debts would be regarded as a violation of the clause of the statute which forbids an unfair preference among 'creditors, though as this record does not 'present that question, we express no 'decided opinion upon it."

If the question of the application of firm property to the payment of the individual debt of one of the partners, without the consent of the others, had been directly before the court the opinion would, very likely, have been in accordance with the opinion of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, in Hartley v. White, decided March 1880. "A transfer of firm property by a partner 'without the knowledge and consent of his co-partner, to pay his own individual debt, is fraudulent as to the firm creditors, and gives the purchaser no title." Central Law Journal, vol. 12, No. 1, p. 15.

Leaving that supposed ground for attachment out of the Code of 1880, was not, in our opinion, nor was it, certainly, with a view to make our attachment law less effective than before.

It was the opinion of Judge Campbell, delivered concurred in by every lawyer on the Code committee, that the latter part of the 5th ground of attachment in the Code of 1871, to-wit: "or given unfair preference to some of them" (creditors) had no legal significance, in view of the fact that it was not intended to prevent a debtor from preferring any creditor he saw proper.

There are two good reasons why the State should be bound to pay to the Federal Government the costs of the State Courts as far as the State Courts are concerned. First, the costs in the State Courts are not so great, second, and second, should the Federal Court fail in his attachment in the Federal Court he would be dismissed, absolutely, with a judgment against him for damages for the wrongful suing out of the attachments; whereas, in the State Court, though defeated in his attachment and a judgment against him for damages, he is not entitled upon the present law to a judgment in personam upon his claim, if valid, with which he could effect the judgment for damages. Should Judge Chandler's decision prevail, as a result, the Federal Courts would gobble up all the immense fees of the State Courts of the unrepresented number of attachments now being sued out. While in fact the State Courts are not doing much for the Federal Government, as a general rule to the Federal Government.

## Natchez and Jackson Railroad.

It is with much pleasure that we state that the Directors of the Natchez, Jackson and Columbus Railroad Company at their meeting yesterday, concluded a very favorable agreement with E. J. Duffin, for grading the road from Martin to the Hinds county line, and completing the grading for the entire route to Jackson. Capt. Duffin will finish the work in time for the 1st of September next, so that those who live along the line of the road may enjoy the benefit of the improved road to ship their cotton crops of 1881 over this road.

THE Vicksburg Herald, referring to the Democratic vote in the Senate against the Grant Pension bill, says that "strong party spirit caused the Democrats to commit a very silly blunder." The Herald seems to have a poor opinion of the party to which it claims to belong.

The Summit Sentinel is all the brighter from having passed through the fiery furnace. It is a staunch paper, racy of the times, and we wish its conductors, the Messrs. Bonney, all the abundant success which they richly deserve.

The Greenback State Executive Committee met in this city Tuesday. Nine members were present, and among other things, the subject of establishing an organ here was discussed.

P. S. I understand John Lynch is endeavoring Hon. LEM. MOORE, of Jackson, for Secretary of the State.

## Remedy by Attachment in Mississippi.

HON. W. H. FITZGERALD'S REPLY TO JUDGE CHANDLER.

GREENADA, Miss., Jan. 24th, 1881. EDITORS CLARION:—In the letter published in THE CLARION of the 20th inst. Judge Chandler, U. S. District Attorney for the Northern District of Mississippi, after stating the anomalous condition of our attachment laws in relation to their enforcement in the State and Federal courts, assumes, that because the Code of 1880 does not contain the provision in regard to giving an unfair preference to some creditor, which was in the Code of 1871, the Federal form is preferable, to non-resident attaching creditors, than the State courts.

He correctly states that the Federal courts administer the law of 1871 while the State courts are governed by the law of 1880. I think, however, the Judge is in error when he says "A foreign creditor suing in the Federal courts, has the advantage of 'this important cause of attachment, over a home creditor suing in the State courts; and it is difficult to understand why the 'Legislature omitted this provision. It has been a leading cause of attachment for 'many years, and had become well understood, though for a time troublesome to the courts to construe, etc."

It has never been construed by the court of last resort in the State.

In the case of Barney v. Scherling, 40 Miss. 320, an effort was made by counsel to have the late High Court pass upon it, but the case was settled upon other grounds and no allusion made to that by the court. It will be instructive to refer to the briefs of counsel in that case on that point.

Editors CLARION—I read a good deal lately about a place in Garfield's cabinet for Bruce (a), a sitting member of the United States Senate, erroneously accredited to this State. Some of the papers say that his appointment would give satisfaction to all the darkeys in the land, from freezing Canada to blooming Florida—that it would immediately stop the exodus—that the persecuted blacks who have already gone would return to the sugar plantations of Louisiana, and the cotton fields of Mississippi.

The late Gov. L. P. Butler, Esq., attorney on the other side, said in his brief: "The 'statute gives an attachment against the estate of a debtor when he is about to assign or dispose of his property with intent to defraud his creditors, or give an 'unfair preference to some of them. Our 'law permits preferences in such cases, and this statute, tacitly permitting the general practice, gives no reason for preferring an 'unfair preference. The preference must be 'unfair; but the law has nowhere defined what an unfair preference is. An 'insolvent may prefer one creditor to the exclusion of another, and this has never been held to be unfair. The law does not 'require him to pay pro rata, but leaves the 'whole matter to his honest judgment,' etc."

This question of unfair preference and a creditor is not alluded to in any of the reported opinions of the Supreme Court, except in the case of Roach v. Brandon, 57 Miss. Opinion p. 501, where the Court, say, "an application of firm assets to his individual debts would be regarded as a violation of the clause of the statute which forbids an unfair preference among 'creditors, though as this record does not 'present that question, we express no 'decided opinion upon it."

If the question of the application of firm property to the payment of the individual debt of one of the partners, without the consent of the others, had been directly before the court the opinion would, very likely, have been in accordance with the opinion of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, in Hartley v. White, decided March 1880. "A transfer of firm property by a partner 'without the knowledge and consent of his co-partner, to pay his own individual debt, is fraudulent as to the firm creditors, and gives the purchaser no title." Central Law Journal, vol. 12, No. 1, p. 15.

Leaving that supposed ground for attachment out of the Code of 1880, was not, in our opinion, nor was it, certainly, with a view to make our attachment law less effective than before.

It was the opinion of Judge Campbell, delivered concurred in by every lawyer on the Code committee, that the latter part of the 5th ground of attachment in the Code of 1871, to-wit: "or given unfair preference to some of them" (creditors) had no legal significance, in view of the fact that it was not intended to prevent a debtor from preferring any creditor he saw proper.

There are two good reasons why the State should be bound to pay to the Federal Government the costs of the State Courts as far as the State Courts are concerned. First, the costs in the State Courts are not so great, second, and second, should the Federal Court fail in his attachment in the Federal Court he would be dismissed, absolutely, with a judgment against him for damages for the wrongful suing out of the attachments; whereas, in the State Court, though defeated in his attachment and a judgment against him for damages, he is not entitled upon the present law to a judgment in personam upon his claim, if valid, with which he could effect the judgment for damages. Should Judge Chandler's decision prevail, as a result, the Federal Courts would gobble up all the immense fees of the State Courts of the unrepresented number of attachments now being sued out. While in fact the State Courts are not doing much for the Federal Government, as a general rule to the Federal Government.

Yours truly, W. H. FITZGERALD.

Natchez and Jackson Railroad.

It is with much pleasure that we state that the Directors of the Natchez, Jackson and Columbus Railroad Company at their meeting yesterday, concluded a very favorable agreement with E. J. Duffin, for grading the road from Martin to the Hinds county line, and completing the grading for the entire route to Jackson. Capt. Duffin will finish the work in time for the 1st of September next, so that those who live along the line of the road may enjoy the benefit of the improved road to ship their cotton crops of 1881 over this road.

THE Vicksburg Herald, referring to the Democratic vote in the Senate against the Grant Pension bill, says that "strong party spirit caused the Democrats to commit a very silly blunder." The Herald seems to have a poor opinion of the party to which it claims to belong.

The Summit Sentinel is all the brighter from having passed through the fiery furnace. It is a staunch paper, racy of the times, and we wish its conductors, the Messrs. Bonney, all the abundant success which they richly deserve.

The Greenback State Executive Committee met in this city Tuesday. Nine members were present, and among other things, the subject of establishing an organ here was discussed.

P. S. I understand John Lynch is endeavoring Hon. LEM. MOORE, of Jackson, for Secretary of the State.

## BRUCE IN THE CABINET.

What the Mississippi Delegation Say About It.

Washington Post. To the representatives of the Democratic party of Mississippi, the Post addressed its query for information, with regard to Bruce's appointment, with the following result: Senator Lamar: "I believe that the selection of Senator Bruce for a Cabinet position would give as much satisfaction to the Southern people as the selection of any white Republican in the Southern States. Mr. Bruce's conduct in the Senate has been such as not to alienate his constituents, Southern people. He has not joined in the abusive warfare upon the South which many of his Republican colleagues in the Senate have constantly pursued. He is an intelligent man, and the best representative of his race in public life."

Mr. Chalmers: "Senator Bruce in the Cabinet would be as satisfactory to the people of Mississippi as the election of any Southern white Republican for such an honor that I could not see how it could be to my district. He is a straightforward man. He secured his election to the Senate in opposition to the selection of a Republican, and he has constantly pursued that policy. When he was Sheriff of any county he performed his duties in a thoroughly non-partisan manner. He has represented the State in the Senate instead of a political faction, and has invariably shown a disposition to be of assistance to the Southern people, and he has never been able to do so without going directly against his party."

Mr. McRae: "It doesn't make any difference to the Southern people what Southern Republican is put in the Cabinet. Senator Bruce would be as satisfactory to the Southern people as any one. He has shown more consideration for his political opponents than a majority of the Southern Republicans. My relations with him are pleasant, and I have always found him willing to do anything for me that he could do without flying in the face of his constituents."

Mr. Singleton: "Senator Bruce evinces good administrative talents in the manner in which he manages and advances the interests of the people of Mississippi, and, we do not expect the appointment of a Southern Democrat to a Cabinet office under the incoming Administration, I know of no Republican that would treat the South better than Senator Bruce. He would make an excellent Secretary of the Interior, or Postmaster-General, or any other office."

General C. E. Hooker, of Mississippi, declined to express himself on the subject, and the reporter was unable to find Mr. Manning.

## Warren County Special Election.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF ELECTION OF